arXiv:1602.05018v1 [math.AP] 16 Feb 2016

INITIAL BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR A SEMILINEAR PARABOLIC EQUATION WITH ABSORPTION AND NONLINEAR NONLOCAL BOUNDARY CONDITION

ALEXANDER GLADKOV

Abstract. In this paper we consider an initial boundary value problem for a semilinear parabolic equation with absorption and nonlinear nonlocal Neumann boundary condition. We prove comparison principle, the existence theorem of a local solution and study the problem of uniqueness and nonuniqueness.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the initial boundary value problem for the following semilinear parabolic equation

$$u_t = \Delta u - c(x,t)u^p,\ x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

with nonlinear nonlocal boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial \nu} = \int_\Omega k(x,y,t)u^l(y,t)\,dy,\ x \in \partial\Omega,\ t \geq 0, \tag{1.2}$$

and initial datum

$$u(x,0) = u_0(x),\ x \in \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

where $p > 0$, $l > 0$, Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 1$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, ν is unit outward normal on $\partial\Omega$.

Throughout this paper we suppose that the functions $c(x,t)$, $k(x,y,t)$ and $u_0(x)$ satisfy the following conditions:

$$c(x,t) \in C^\alpha_{loc}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0,+\infty)),\ 0 < \alpha < 1,\ c(x,t) \geq 0;$$
$$k(x,y,t) \in C(\partial\Omega \times \overline{\Omega} \times [0,+\infty)),\ k(x,y,t) \geq 0;$$
$$u_0(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}),\ u_0(x) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ \frac{\partial u_0(x)}{\partial \nu} = \int_\Omega k(x,y,0)u_0^l(y)\,dy \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

A lot of articles have been devoted to the investigation of initial boundary value problems for parabolic equations and systems with nonlinear nonlocal Dirichlet boundary condition (see, for example, [6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27] and the references therein). In particular, the initial boundary value problem for equation (1.1) with nonlocal boundary condition

$$u(x,t) = \int_\Omega k(x,y,t)u^l(y,t)\,dy,\ x \in \partial\Omega,\ t > 0,$$

was considered for $c(x,t) \leq 0$ and $c(x,t) \geq 0$ in [13, 14] and [17, 18] respectively. The problem (1.1)–(1.3) with $c(x,t) \leq 0$ were investigated in [15, 16].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35K20, 35K58, 35K61.

Key words and phrases. semilinear parabolic equation, nonlocal boundary condition, local solution, uniqueness.

We note that for $p < 1$ and $l < 1$ the nonlinearities in equation (1.1) and boundary condition (1.2) are non-Lipschitzian. The problem of uniqueness and nonuniqueness for different parabolic nonlinear equations with non-Lipschitzian data in bounded domain has been addressed by several authors (see, for example, [2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 14, 18, 21] and the references therein).

The aim of this paper is to study problem (1.1)–(1.3) for any $p > 0$ and $l > 0$. We prove existence of a local solution and establish some uniqueness and nonuniqueness results.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section we prove the existence of a local solution. Comparison principle and the problem of uniqueness and nonuniqueness for (1.1)–(1.3) are investigated in Section 3.

2. Local existence

In this section a local existence theorem for (1.1)–(1.3) will be proved. We begin with definitions of a supersolution, a subsolution and a maximal solution of (1.1)–(1.3). Let $Q_T = \Omega \times (0,T)$, $S_T = \partial\Omega \times (0,T)$, $\Gamma_T = S_T \cup \overline{\Omega} \times \{0\}$, $T > 0$.

Definition 2.1. We say that a nonnegative function $u(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(Q_T) \cap C^{1,0}(Q_T \cup \Gamma_T)$ is a supersolution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T if

$$u_t \geq \Delta u - c(x,t)u^p, \ (x,t) \in Q_T, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial \nu} \geq \int_\Omega k(x,y,t)u^l(y,t)\,dy, \ x \in \partial\Omega, \ 0 \leq t < T, \tag{2.2}$$

$$u(x,0) \geq u_0(x), \ x \in \Omega, \tag{2.3}$$

and $u(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(Q_T) \cap C^{1,0}(Q_T \cup \Gamma_T)$ is a subsolution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T if $u \geq 0$ and it satisfies (2.1)–(2.3) in the reverse order. We say that $u(x,t)$ is a solution of problem (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T if $u(x,t)$ is both a subsolution and a supersolution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T.

Definition 2.2. We say that a solution $u(x,t)$ of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T is a maximal solution if for any other solution $v(x,t)$ of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T the inequality $v(x,t) \leq u(x,t)$ is satisfied for $(x,t) \in Q_T \cup \Gamma_T$.

Definition 2.3. We say that u is a strict supersolution of problem (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T if it is a supersolution in Q_T and the inequality in (2.2) is strict. Analogously we say that u is a strict subsolution of problem (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T if it is a subsolution in Q_T and the inequality in (2.2) is reversed and strict.

Let $\{\varepsilon_m\}$ be decreasing to 0 sequence such that $0 < \varepsilon_m < 1$. For $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_m$ let $u_{0\varepsilon}(x)$ be the functions with the following properties: $u_{0\varepsilon}(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, $u_{0\varepsilon}(x) \geq \varepsilon$, $u_{0\varepsilon_i}(x) \geq u_{0\varepsilon_j}(x)$ for $\varepsilon_i > \varepsilon_j$, $u_{0\varepsilon}(x) \to u_0(x)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial u_{0\varepsilon}(x)}{\partial \nu} = \int_\Omega k(x,y,0)u_{0\varepsilon}^l(y)\,dy,$$

for $x \in \partial\Omega$. Since the nonlinearities in (1.1), (1.2) , the Lipschitz condition can be not satisfied, and thus we need to consider the following auxiliary problem:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - c(x,t)u^p + c(x,t)\varepsilon^p & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial \nu} = \int_\Omega k(x,y,t)u^l(y,t)dy & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega, \ t \geq 0, \\ u(x,0) = u_{0\varepsilon}(x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_m$. The notion of a solution u_ε for problem (2.4) can be defined in a similar way as in the Definition 2.1.

Theorem 2.4. *Problem (2.4) has a unique solution in Q_T for small values of T.*

Proof. We start the proof with the construction of a supersolution of (2.4). Let $\sup_\Omega u_{0\varepsilon}(x) \le M$. Denote $K = \sup_{\partial\Omega\times Q_1} k(x,y,t)$ and introduce an auxiliary function $\psi(x)$ with the following properties:

$$\psi(x) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}),\ \inf_\Omega \psi(x) \ge 1,\ \inf_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial\psi(x)}{\partial\nu} \ge KM^{l-1}\max\{1,\exp(l-1)\}\int_\Omega \psi^l(y)dy.$$

Set $\alpha = \sup_\Omega \Delta\psi(x)$. Then it is not difficult to check that

$$w(x,t) = M\exp(\alpha t)\psi(x)$$

is a supersolution of (2.4) in Q_T if $T \le \min\{1/\alpha, 1\}$.

To prove the existence of a solution for (2.4) we introduce the set

$$B = \{h(x,t) \in C(\overline{Q_T}) : \varepsilon \le h(x,t) \le w(x,t),\ h(x,0) = u_{0\varepsilon}(x)\}$$

and consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - c(x,t)u^p + c(x,t)\varepsilon^p & \text{for } x\in\Omega,\quad 0<t<T,\\ \frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial\nu} = \int_\Omega k(x,y,t)v^l(y,t)dy & \text{for } x\in\partial\Omega,\ 0\le t<T,\\ u(x,0) = u_{0\varepsilon}(x) & \text{for } x\in\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where $v \in B$. It is obvious, B is a nonempty convex subset of $C(\overline{Q_T})$. By classical theory [22] problem (2.5) has a solution $u \in C^{2,1}(Q_T)\cap C^{1,0}(\overline{Q}_T)$. Let us call $Av = u$. In order to show that A has a fixed point in B we verify that A is a continuous mapping from B into itself such that AB is relatively compact. Thanks to a comparison principle for (2.5) we have that A maps B into itself.

Let $G(x,y;t)$ denote the Green's function for a heat equation given by

$$u_t - \Delta u = 0 \ \text{ for } \ x\in\Omega,\ t>0$$

with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition. Then $u(x,t)$ is a solution of (2.5) in Q_T if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &= \int_\Omega G(x,y;t)u_{0\varepsilon}(y)\,dy + \int_0^t\int_\Omega G(x,y;t-\tau)c(y,\tau)(\varepsilon^p - u^p(y,\tau))\,dyd\tau \\ &+ \int_0^t\int_{\partial\Omega} G(x,\xi;t-\tau)\int_\Omega k(\xi,y,\tau)v^l(y,\tau)\,dy\,dS_\xi d\tau \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for $(x,t)\in Q_T$.

We claim that A is continuous. In fact let v_k be a sequence in B converging to $v\in B$ in $C(\overline{Q_T})$. Denote $u_k = Av_k$. Then by (2.6) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |u-u_k| &\le \theta\sup_{Q_T}|u-u_k|\int_0^t\int_\Omega G(x,y;t-\tau)c(y,\tau)\,dyd\tau \\ &+ \sup_{Q_T}|v^l - v_k^l|\int_0^t\int_{\partial\Omega} G(x,\xi;t-\tau)\int_\Omega k(\xi,y,\tau)\,dydS_\xi d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta = p\max\{\varepsilon^{p-1}, \sup_{Q_T} w^{p-1}\}$. We note that (see [11])

$$\theta\sup_{Q_T}\int_0^t\int_\Omega G(x,y;t-\tau)c(y,\tau)\,dyd\tau < 1$$

for small values of T. Now we can conclude that u_k converges to u_ε in $C(\overline{Q_T})$.

The equicontinuity of AB follows from (2.6) and the properties of the Green's function (see, for example, [25]). The Ascoli-Arzelá theorem guarantees the relative compactness of AB. Thus we are able to apply the Schauder-Tychonoff fixed point theorem and conclude that A has a fixed point in B if T is small. Now if u_ε is a fixed point of A, $u_\varepsilon \in C^{2,1}(Q_T) \cap C^{1,0}(\overline{Q}_T)$ and it is a solution of (2.4) in Q_T. Uniqueness of the solution follows from a comparison principle for (2.4) which can be proved in a similar way as in the next section. □

Now, let $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1$. Then it is easy to see that $u_{\varepsilon_2}(x,t)$ is a supersolution of problem (2.4) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$. Applying to problem (2.4) a comparison principle we have $u_{\varepsilon_1}(x,t) \le u_{\varepsilon_2}(x,t)$. Using the last inequality and the continuation principle of solutions we deduce that the existence time of u_ε does not decrease as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Taking $\varepsilon \to 0$, we get $u_m(x,t) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u_\varepsilon(x,t) \ge 0$ and $u_m(x,t)$ exists in Q_T for some $T > 0$. By dominated convergence theorem, $u_m(x,t)$ satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} u_m(x,t) &= \int_\Omega G(x,y;t)u_0(y)\,dy - \int_0^t \int_\Omega G(x,y;t-\tau)c(y,\tau)u_m^p(y,\tau))\,dyd\tau \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega} G(x,\xi;t-\tau) \int_\Omega k(\xi,y,\tau)u_m^l(y,\tau)\,dyd\xi d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for $(x,t) \in Q_T$. Further, the interior regularity of $u_m(x,t)$ follows from the continuity of $u_m(x,t)$ in Q_T and the properties of the Green's function. Obviously, $u_m(x,t)$ satisfies (1.1)–(1.3).

Theorem 2.5. *Problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a solution in Q_T for small values of T.*

3. Uniqueness and nonuniqueness

We start this section with a comparison principle for problem (1.1)–(1.3) which is used below.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}$ be a supersolution and a subsolution of problem (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T, respectively. Suppose that $\underline{u}(x,t) > 0$ or $\overline{u}(x,t) > 0$ in $Q_T \cup \Gamma_T$ if $l < 1$. Then $\overline{u}(x,t) \ge \underline{u}(x,t)$ in $Q_T \cup \Gamma_T$.*

Proof. Suppose that $l \ge 1$. Let $T_0 \in (0,T)$ and $u_{0\varepsilon}(x)$ have the same properties as in previous section but $u_{0\varepsilon}(x) \to \underline{u}(x,0)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We can construct a solution $u_m(x,t)$ of (1.1)–(1.3) with $u_0(x) = \underline{u}(x,0)$ in the following way $u_m(x,t) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u_\varepsilon(x,t)$ where $u_\varepsilon(x,t)$ is a solution of (2.4). To establish theorem we shall show that

$$\underline{u}(x,t) \le u_m(x,t) \le \overline{u}(x,t) \text{ in } \overline{Q}_{T_0} \text{ for any } T_0. \tag{3.1}$$

We prove the second inequality in (3.1) only since the proof of the first one is similar. Let $\varphi(x,t) \in C^{2,1}(\overline{Q}_{T_0})$ be a nonnegative function such that

$$\frac{\partial\varphi(x,t)}{\partial\nu} = 0,\ (x,t) \in S_{T_0}.$$

If we multiply the first equation in (2.4) by $\varphi(x,t)$ and then integrate over Q_t for $0 < t < T_0$, we get

$$\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon(x,t)\varphi(x,t)\,dx \le \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon(x,0)\varphi(x,0)\,dx + \varepsilon^p \int_0^t \int_\Omega c(x,\tau)\varphi\,dxd\tau$$

$$+ \int_0^t \int_\Omega (u_\varepsilon \varphi_\tau + u_\varepsilon \Delta\varphi - c(x,\tau) u_\varepsilon^p \varphi)\, dx d\tau$$
$$+ \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x,\tau) \int_\Omega k(x,y,\tau) u_\varepsilon^l(y,\tau)\, dy\, dS_x d\tau, \qquad (3.2)$$

On the other hand, $\overline{u}$ satisfies (3.2) with reversed inequality and with $\varepsilon = 0$. Set $w(x,t) = u_\varepsilon(x,t) - \overline{u}(x,t)$. Then $w(x,t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega w(x,t)\varphi(x,t)\, dx &\le \int_\Omega w(x,0)\varphi(x,0)\, dx + \varepsilon^p \int_0^t \int_\Omega c(x,\tau)\varphi\, dx d\tau \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_\Omega (\varphi_\tau + \Delta\varphi - c(x,\tau) p\theta_1^{p-1}\varphi)) w\, dx d\tau \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x,\tau) \int_\Omega k(x,y,\tau) l\theta_2^{l-1} w(y,\tau)\, dy dS_x d\tau, \qquad (3.3)\end{aligned}$$

where θ_1 and θ_2 are some continuous functions between u_ε and $\overline{u}$. Note here that by hypotheses for $c(x,t)$, $k(x,y,t)$, $u_\varepsilon(x,t)$ and $\overline{u}(x,t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&0 \le c(x,t) \le M,\ \ 0 \le \overline{u}(x,t) \le M\ \ \varepsilon \le u_\varepsilon(x,t) \le M\ \text{ in } \overline{Q}_{T_0} \\ &\text{and } 0 \le k(x,y,t) \le M\ \text{ in } \partial\Omega \times \overline{Q}_{T_0}, \qquad (3.4)\end{aligned}$$

where M is some positive constant. Then, it is easy to see from (3.4) that θ_1^{p-1} and θ_2^{l-1} are positive and bounded functions in $\overline{Q}_{T_0}$ and moreover, $\theta_2^{l-1} \le M^{l-1}$. Define a sequence $\{a_n\}$ in the following way: $a_n \in C^\infty(\overline{Q}_{T_0})$, $a_n \ge 0$ and $a_n \to c(x,t)p\theta_1^{p-1}$ as $n \to \infty$ in $L^1(Q_{T_0})$. Now, consider a backward problem given by

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_\tau + \Delta\varphi - a_n\varphi = 0 & \text{for } x \in \Omega,\ \ 0 < \tau < t, \\ \frac{\partial\varphi(x,\tau)}{\partial\nu} = 0 & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega,\ \ 0 \le \tau < t, \\ \varphi(x,t) = \psi(x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \qquad (3.5)$$

where $\psi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and $0 \le \psi(x) \le 1$. Denote a solution of (3.5) as $\varphi_n(x,\tau)$. Then by the standard theory for linear parabolic equations (see [22], for example), we find that $\varphi_n \in C^{2,1}(\overline{Q}_t)$, $0 \le \varphi_n(x,\tau) \le 1$ in $\overline{Q}_t$. Putting $\varphi = \varphi_n$ in (3.3) and passing then to the limit as $n \to \infty$ we infer

$$\int_\Omega w(x,t)\psi(x)\, dx \le \int_\Omega w(x,0)_+\, dx + \varepsilon^p M T_0 |\Omega| + l M^l |\partial\Omega| \int_0^t \int_\Omega w(y,\tau)_+\, dy d\tau, \qquad (3.6)$$

where $w_+ = \max\{w, 0\}$, $|\partial\Omega|$ and $|\Omega|$ are the Lebesgue measures of $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. Since (3.6) holds for every $\psi(x)$, we can choose a sequence $\{\psi_n\}$ converging on Ω to $\psi(x) = 1$ if $w(x,t) > 0$ and $\psi(x) = 0$ otherwise. Hence, from (3.6) we get

$$\int_\Omega w(x,t)_+\, dx \le \int_\Omega w(x,0)_+\, dx + \varepsilon^p M T_0 |\Omega| + l M^l |\partial\Omega| \int_0^t \int_\Omega w(y,\tau)_+\, dy d\tau.$$

Applying now Gronwall's inequality and passing to the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$, the conclusion of this theorem follows for $l \ge 1$. For the case $l < 1$ we can consider $w(x,t) = \underline{u}(x,t) - \overline{u}(x,t)$ and prove the theorem in a similar way using the positiveness of a subsolution or a supersolution. □

Corollary 3.2. *Problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a maximal solution in Q_T for small values of T.*

Proof. In the previous section we prove the existence of a local solution $u_m(x,t) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u_\varepsilon(x,t)$. Let $v(x,t)$ be any other solution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T. By Theorem 3.1 we have $u_\varepsilon(x,t) \geq v(x,t)$. Taking $\varepsilon \to 0$, we conclude $u_m(x,t) \geq v(x,t)$. Obviously, $u_m(x,t)$ is a maximal solution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T. □

Next lemma shows the positiveness of all nontrivial solutions for $t > 0$ if $p \geq 1$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let u_0 is a nontrivial function in Ω, $p \geq 1$ or $c(x,t) \equiv 0$. Suppose u is a solution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T. Then $u > 0$ in $Q_T \cup S_T$.*

Proof. As $c(x,t)$ and $u(x,t)$ are continuous in $\overline{Q}_T$ functions then we have

$$\max\{c(x,t), u(x,t)\} \leq M, \ (x,t) \in \overline{Q}_T \tag{3.7}$$

with some positive constant M. Now we put $v = u\exp(\lambda t)$ where $\lambda \geq M^p$. It is easy to verify that $v_t - \Delta v \geq 0$. Since $v(x,0) = u_0(x) \not\equiv 0$ in Ω and $v(x,t) \geq 0$ in Q_T, by the strong maximum principle $v(x,t) > 0$ in Q_T. Let $v(x_0,t_0) = 0$ in some point $(x_0,t_0) \in S_T$. Then according to Theorem 3.6 of [10] it yields $\partial v(x_0,t_0)/\partial\nu < 0$, which contradicts (1.2). □

As a simple consequence of Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we get the following uniqueness result for problem (1.1)–(1.3).

Theorem 3.4. *Let problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a solution in Q_T with nonnegative initial data for $l \geq 1$ and with positive initial data under the conditions $l < 1$, $p \geq 1$ or a positive in $Q_T \cup \Gamma_T$ solution if $\max(p,l) < 1$. Then a solution of (1.1)–(1.3) is unique in Q_T.*

Now we shall prove the nonuniqueness of a solution of our problem with trivial initial datum for $l < p$. We note that problem (1.1)–(1.3) with trivial initial datum has trivial solution.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $l < min\{1,p\}$ and $u_0(x) \equiv 0$. Suppose that*

$$k(x,y_0,t_0) > 0 \ \textit{for any} \ x \in \partial\Omega \ \textit{and some} \ y_0 \in \partial\Omega \ \textit{and} \ t_0 \in [0,T). \tag{3.8}$$

Then maximal solution $u_m(x,t)$ of problem (1.1)–(1.3) is nontrivial function in Q_T.

Proof. As we showed in Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 3.2 a maximal solution $u_m(x,t) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u_\varepsilon(x,t)$, where $u_\varepsilon(x,t)$ is some positive in $\overline{Q}_T$ supersolution of (1.1)–(1.3). To prove theorem we construct a nontrivial nonnegative subsolution $\underline{u}(x,t)$ of (1.1)–(1.3) with trivial initial datum. By Theorem 3.1 then we have $u_\varepsilon(x,t) \geq \underline{u}(x,t)$ and therefore maximal solution $u_m(x,t)$ is nontrivial function.

To construct a subsolution we use the change of variables in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ as in [3]. Let $\overline{x}$ be a point in $\partial\Omega$. We denote by $\widehat{n}(\overline{x})$ the inner unit normal to $\partial\Omega$ at the point $\overline{x}$. Since $\partial\Omega$ is smooth it is well known that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the mapping $\psi : \partial\Omega \times [0,\delta] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ given by $\psi(\overline{x},s) = \overline{x} + s\widehat{n}(\overline{x})$ defines new coordinates $(\overline{x},s)$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ in $\overline{\Omega}$.

A straightforward computation shows that, in these coordinates, Δ applied to a function $g(\overline{x},s) = g(s)$, which is independent of the variable $\overline{x}$, evaluated at a point $(\overline{x},s)$ is given by

$$\Delta g(\overline{x},s) = \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial s^2}(\overline{x},s) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{H_j(\overline{x})}{1 - sH_j(\overline{x})} \frac{\partial g}{\partial s}(\overline{x},s), \tag{3.9}$$

where $H_j(\overline{x})$ for $j = 1, ..., n-1$, denotes the principal curvatures of $\partial\Omega$ at $\overline{x}$.

Under the assumptions of the theorem there exists $\overline{t} > 0$ such that $k(x, y, t) > 0$ for $t_0 \le t \le t_0 + \overline{t}$, $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $y \in V(y_0)$, where $V(y_0)$ is some neighborhood of y_0 in $\overline{\Omega}$.

Let $1/(1-l) < \alpha \le 1/(1-p)$ for $p < 1$ and $\alpha > 1/(1-l)$ for $p \ge 1$, $2 < \beta < 2/(1-p)$ for $p < 1$ and $\beta > 2$ for $p \ge 1$ and assume that $A > 0$, $0 < \xi_0 \le 1$ and $0 < T_0 < \min(T - t_0, \overline{t}, \delta^2)$. For points in $\partial\Omega \times [0, \delta] \times (t_0, t_0 + T_0]$ of coordinates $(\overline{x}, s, t)$ define

$$\underline{u}(\overline{x}, s, t) = A(t - t_0)^{\alpha} \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta} \tag{3.10}$$

and extend $\underline{u}$ as zero to the whole of $\overline{Q_\tau}$ with $\tau = t_0 + T_0$. Using (3.9), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underline{u}_t(\overline{x}, s, t) - \Delta\underline{u}(\overline{x}, s, t) + c(x, t)\underline{u}^p(\overline{x}, s, t) = \alpha A(t - t_0)^{\alpha - 1} \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta} \\
&+ \quad \frac{\beta}{2} A s (t - t_0)^{\alpha - 3/2} \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta - 1} - \beta(\beta - 1) A (t - t_0)^{\alpha - 1} \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta - 2} \\
&- \quad \beta A (t - t_0)^{\alpha - 1/2} \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{H_j(\overline{x})}{1 - s H_j(\overline{x})} \\
&+ \quad A^p c(x, t) (t - t_0)^{\alpha p} \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta p} \le 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $(\overline{x}, s, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, \delta] \times (t_0, \tau)$ and small values of ξ_0.

It is obvious,

$$\frac{\partial \underline{u}}{\partial \nu}(\overline{x}, 0, t) = -\frac{\partial \underline{u}}{\partial s}(\overline{x}, 0, t) = \beta A (t - t_0)^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2}} \xi_0^{\beta - 1}, \ \overline{x} \in \partial\Omega, \ t_0 < t < \tau.$$

To prove that $\underline{u}$ is the subsolution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_τ it is enough to check the validity of the following inequality

$$\beta A (t - t_0)^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2}} \xi_0^{\beta - 1} \le A^l (t - t_0)^{\alpha l} \int_{\partial\Omega \times [0, \delta]} k(x, (\overline{y}, s), t) |J(\overline{y}, s)| \left(\xi_0 - \frac{s}{\sqrt{t - t_0}} \right)_+^{\beta l} d\overline{y}\, ds \tag{3.11}$$

for $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $t_0 < t < \tau$. Here $J(\overline{y}, s)$ is Jacobian of the change of variables. Estimating the integral I in the right-hand side of (3.11)

$$I = (t - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\partial\Omega} d\overline{y} \int_0^{\xi_0} k(x, (\overline{y}, z\sqrt{t - t_0}), t) |J(\overline{y}, z\sqrt{t - t_0})| \, (\xi_0 - z)_+^{\beta l} \, dz \ge C (t - t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where positive constant C does not depend on t, we obtain that (3.11) is true if we take T_0 sufficiently small. □

Remark 3.6. Let $c(x, t_0) \le c_0$ and $k(x, y, t_0) \ge k_0$ for $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \partial\Omega$, some $t_0 \in [0, T)$ and positive constants c_0 and k_0. Then nonuniqueness of trivial solution for our problem holds for $l = p < 1$ and large values of k_0/c_0. To prove this we can take in (3.10) $\alpha = 1/(1-l)$, $\beta = 2/(1-l)$ and A in a suitable way.

To prove the uniqueness of trivial solution of (1.1)–(1.3) with $u_0(x) \equiv 0$ we need the following comparison principle.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ be a subsolution and a strict supersolution of (1.1)–(1.3) in Q_T, respectively. Then $\overline{u} \geq \underline{u}$ in $\overline{Q}_T$.*

Proof. Let $v = \overline{u} + \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that for any $T_0 < T$ under suitable choice of ε we have

$$\frac{\partial v(x,t)}{\partial \nu} \geq \int_\Omega k(x,y,t) v^l(y,t) dy \ \text{ for } \ x \in \partial\Omega, \ \ 0 \leq t \leq T_0.$$

Now we can apply Theorem 3.1 to get the inequality $v \geq \underline{u}$ in $\overline{Q}_{T_0}$. Passing here to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ we prove the lemma. □

Theorem 3.8. *Let $p < l < 1$ and $u_0(x) \equiv 0$. Suppose that $c(x,t) \geq c_1 > 0$ for $(x,t) \in \overline{Q}_T$. Then the solution $u \equiv 0$ of problem (1.1)–(1.3) is unique in Q_T.*

Proof. Since there is the comparison principle for a solution and a strict supersolution of (1.1)–(1.3), it is sufficiently to construct arbitrarily small strict supersolutions which have a positive values on $\partial\Omega$ (see [5] for another problem).

We shall use the change of variables in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ which we introduced in Theorem 3.5. Let $(1-l)/2 < \gamma < (1-p)/2$, $0 < \varepsilon < \delta^{1/\gamma}$, $A > 0$ and $0 < \xi_0 \leq 1$. For points in $\partial\Omega \times [0,\delta] \times [0,T]$ of coordinates $(\overline{x}, s, t)$ define

$$\overline{u}_\varepsilon(\overline{x}, s, t) = \varepsilon A \left(\xi_0 - \varepsilon^{-\gamma} s\right)_+^{1/\gamma} \tag{3.12}$$

and extend $\underline{u}_\varepsilon$ as zero to the whole of $\overline{Q_T}$. Using (3.9), we get that

$$\overline{u}_{\varepsilon t}(\overline{x}, s, t) - \Delta \overline{u}_\varepsilon(\overline{x}, s, t) + c(x,t) \overline{u}_\varepsilon^p(\overline{x}, s, t) \geq 0$$

in Q_T for small values of ξ_0.

To show that $\overline{u}_\varepsilon$ is a strict supersolution we need to prove the following inequality

$$\frac{A}{\gamma} \varepsilon^{1-\gamma} \xi_0^{(1-\gamma)/\gamma} > (\varepsilon A)^l \int_{\partial\Omega \times [0,\delta]} k(x, (\overline{y}, s), t) |J(\overline{y}, s)| \left(\xi_0 - \varepsilon^{-\gamma} s\right)_+^{l/\gamma} d\overline{y}\, ds \tag{3.13}$$

for $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 \leq t < T$. Let $k(x,y,t) \leq k_1$ in Q_T. Then estimating the right-hand side of (3.13) J, we get

$$J \leq k_1 C A^l \varepsilon^{l+\gamma} \xi_0^{(l+\gamma)/\gamma},$$

where positive constant C depend only on p, l and $\partial\Omega$. Hence (3.13) holds if we take ξ_0 small enough.

We are in a position to complete the proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a solution of (1.1)–(1.3) with trivial initial function which is not identically zero in Q_T. Then by Lemma 3.7 it follows that

$$u(x,t) \leq u_\varepsilon(x,t) \ \text{ in } \ Q_T$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon < \delta^{1/\gamma}$. This is a contradiction since $u_\varepsilon \to 0$ uniformly on $\overline{Q}_T$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. □

Remark 3.9. Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.8 fulfill but only $l = p$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 3.8 holds for large values of c_1/k_1, where k_1 was defined in the proof. To prove this we can take in (3.12) $\gamma = (1-l)/2$ and A in a suitable way.

Remark 3.10. Note that under the assumptions of Theorem 3.8 or Remark 3.9 there exists a class of nontrivial initial data such that $u(x,t) \equiv 0$ for large values of t. To prove this we can modify function $\overline{u}_\varepsilon$ from (3.12) in the following way

$$\overline{u}_\varepsilon(\overline{x}, s, t) = \varepsilon \left(\xi_0 - \varepsilon^{-\gamma} s - \mu t\right)_+^{1/\gamma}, \ \mu > 0.$$

References

[1] J. Aguirre and M. Escobedo, *A Cauchy problem for $u_t - \Delta u = u^p$: Asymptotic behavior of solutions*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse **8** (1986-87), 175–203.

[2] P. Bokes, *A uniqueness result for a semilinear parabolic system*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **331** (2007), 567–584.

[3] C. Cortazar, M. del Pino and M. Elgueta, *On the short-time behaviour of the free boundary of a porous medium equation*, Duke Math. J. **87** (1997), no. 1, 133–149.

[4] C. Cortazar, M. Elgueta and J. D. Rossi, *Uniqueness and non-uniqueness for a system of heat equations with non-linear coupling at the boundary*, Nonlinear Anal. **37** (1999), no. 2, 257–267.

[5] C. Cortazar, M. Elgueta and J. D. Rossi, *Uniqueness and nonuniqueness for the porous medium equation with non linear boundary condition*, Diff. Int. Equat. **16** (2003), no. 10, 1215–1222.

[6] K. Deng, *Comparison principle for some nonlocal problems*, Quart. Appl. Math. **50** (1992), no. 3, 517–522.

[7] M. Escobedo and M. A. Herrero, *A semilinear parabolic system in a bounded domain*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **CLXV** (1993), 315–336.

[8] Z.B. Fang and J. Zhang, *Global and blow-up solutions for the nonlocal p-Laplacian evolution equationwith weighted nonlinear nonlocal boundary condition*, J. Integral Equat. Appl. **26** (2014), no. 2, 171–196.

[9] H. Fujita and S. Watanabe, *On the uniqueness and non-uniqueness of solutions of initial value problems for some quasi-linear parabolic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **21** (1968), no. 6, 631–652.

[10] B. Hu, *Blow-up theories for semilinear parabolic equations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **2018** (2011), 127 p.

[11] B. Hu and H.-M. Yin, *Critical exponents for a system of heat equations coupled in a nonlinear boundary condition*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **19** (1996), no. 14, 1099–1120.

[12] Y. Gao and W. Gao, *Existence and blow-up of solutions for a porous medium equation with nonlocal boundary condition*, Appl. Anal. **90** (2011), no. 5, 799–809.

[13] A. Gladkov and M. Guedda, *Blow-up problem for semilinear heat equation with absorption and a nonlocal boundary condition*, Nonlinear Anal. **74** (2011), no. 13, 4573–4580.

[14] A. Gladkov and M. Guedda, *Semilinear heat equation with absorption and a nonlocal boundary condition*, Appl. Anal. **91** (2012), no. 12, 2267–2276.

[15] A. Gladkov and T. Kavitova, *Initial boundary value problem for a semilinear parabolic equation with nonlinear nonlocal boundary conditions*, Ukrain. Math. J., article in press.

[16] A. Gladkov and T. Kavitova, *Blow-up problem for semilinear heat equation with nonlinear nonlocal boundary condition*, Appl. Anal., article in press.

[17] A. Gladkov and K. I. Kim, *Blow-up of solutions for semilinear heat equation with nonlinear nonlocal boundary condition*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **338** (2008), 264–273.

[18] A. Gladkov and K. I. Kim, *Uniqueness and nonuniqueness for reaction-diffusion equation with nonlocal boundary condition*, Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. **19** (2009), no. 1, 39–49.

[19] A. Gladkov and A. Nikitin, *A reaction-diffusion system with nonlinear nonlocal boundary conditions*, Int. J. Partial Differential Equations **2014** (2014), Article ID 523656, 10 pages.

[20] C. S. Kahane, *On the asymptotic behavior of solutions of parabolic equations*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **33** (1983), no. 108, 262–285.

[21] M. Kordoš, *On uniqueness for a semilinear parabolic system coupled in an equation and a boundary condition*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **298** (2004), 655–666.

[22] Ladyzhenskaja, O., Solonnikov, V. and Ural'ceva, N., *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Transl. Math. Monographs 23(1968).

[23] D. Liu, *Blow-up for a degenerate and singular parabolic equation with nonlocal boundary condition*, J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl. **9** (2016), 208–218.

[24] D. Liu and C. Mu, *Blowup properties for a semilinear reaction-diffusion system with nonlinear nonlocal boundary conditions*, Abstr. Appl. Anal. **2010** (2010), Article ID 148035, 17 pages.
[25] C. V. Pao, *Nonlinear parabolic and elliptic equations*, Plenum Press, New York, 1992.
[26] G. Zhong and L. Tian *Blow up problems for a degenerate parabolic equation with nonlocal source and nonlocal nonlinear boundary condition*, Boundary Value Problems **2012** (2012), no. 45, 14 pages.
[27] J. Zhou and D. Yang *Blowup for a degenerate and singular parabolic equation with nonlocal source and nonlocal boundary*, Appl. Math. Comput. **256** (2015), 881884.

Alexander Gladkov, Department of Mechanics and Mathematics, Belarusian State University, Nezavisimosti Avenue 4, 220030 Minsk, Belarus
E-mail address: gladkoval@mail.ru